BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN SERVICE DISTRICT

FOR THE PURPOSE OF AMENDING)	RESOLUTION NO. 86-691
RESOLUTION NO. 86-659, AND REVIS-)	
ING THE FY 1986-87 BUDGET AND)	Introduced by the
APPROPRIATIONS SCHEDULE)	Executive Officer

WHEREAS, The Council of the Metropolitan Service District has authorized an intergovernmental agreement with Marion County for the disposal of solid waste; and

WHEREAS, Costs associated with that agreement were not anticipated in the preparation of the current budget; and

WHEREAS, Adequate contingency is available in the Solid Waste Operating Fund for this expense; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED,

That Resolution No. 86-659, Exhibit A, FY 1986-87 Budget, and Exhibit B, Schedule of Appropriations, are hereby amended as shown in Exhibits A and B to this Resolution.

ADOPTED by the Council of the Metropolitan Service District this 9th day of October , 1986.

Richard Waker, Presiding Officer

JS/gl 6297C/471-2 09/26/86

EXHIBIT A SOLID WASTE OPERATING FUND

	Current Budget	Revision	Proposed Revised Budget
Personal Services	\$ 1,113,807	\$ -0-	\$1,113,807
Materials & Services Payments to Other Agencies All Other Accounts Total Materials & Services	\$ 1,231,800 6,447,430 \$ 7,679,230	\$471,000 -0- \$471,000	\$ 1,702,800 6,447,430 \$ 8,150,230
Capital Outlay Transfers Contingency Unappropriated Balance	\$ 88,800 3,652,312 2,671,533 63,333	\$ -0- -0- (471,000) -0-	•
TOTAL FUND	\$15,269,105	\$ -0-	\$15,269,105
JS/q1			

JS/g1 6297C/471-1 09/25/86

EXHIBIT A

SOLID WASTE: ST. JOHNS LANDFILL
(For information only)

	Current Budget	Revision	Proposed Revised Budget
Materials & Services			
Payments to Other Agencies	\$ 374,000	\$471,000	\$ 845,000
All Other Accounts	3,348,900	<u> </u>	3,348,900
Total Materials & Services	\$3,722,900	\$471,000	\$4,193,900
Contingency	\$1,752,931	\$(471,000)	\$1,281,931
All Other Accounts	2 026 620	0	2 226 622
All Other Accounts	2,036,629		2,036,629
TOTAL PROGRAM	\$7,512,460	\$ -0-	\$7,512,460

JS/gl 6297C/471-1 09/25/86

EXHIBIT B

SCHEDULE OF APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL FUND	Appr	dopted opriation 1986-87	Revision		Revised ropriation
Gauss 2.1			,		
Council Personal Services			_		
Materials & Services	\$	75,646	-0-	\$	75,646
Capital Outlay		59,020 -0-	-0-		59,020
Subtotal	\$	134,666	-0-	\$	$\frac{-0-}{134,666}$
	٧	134,000	-0-	ş	134,000
Executive Management					
Personal Services	\$	345,785	-0-	\$	345,785
Materials & Services	•	102,017	-0-	•	102,017
Capital Outlay		2,442	_		2,442
Subtotal	\$	450,244	<u>-0-</u>	\$	450,244
Windows A S. J. J. J. J. J. J.					·
Finance & Administration	_	444 4			
Personal Services Materials & Services	\$	666,677	-0-	\$	666 , 677
Capital Outlay		401,079	-0-		401,079
Subtotal	e T	9,200 ,076,956	<u>-0-</u>	45	9,200
babcocar	ŞΤ	,0/0,950	-0-	ŞŢ	,076,956
Public Affairs					
Personal Services	\$	295,169	-0-	\$	295,169
Materials & Services	•	48,181	-0-	Ψ.	48,181
Capital Outlay		3,409			3,409
Subtotal	\$	346,758	-0-	\$	346,758
General Expense					-
Contingency Transfers	\$	62,503	-0-	\$	62,503
Subtotal	<u>~</u>	760,828	<u>-0-</u>		760,828
Subcocal	\$	823,331	-0-	\$	823,331
Unappropriated Balance	\$	63,334	-0-	\$	63,334
omericanist bulance	Y	03/334	-0-	ş	03,334
Total General Fund Requirements	\$2	,895,290	-0-	\$2	,895,290
		•			, ,
INTERGOVERNMENTAL RESOURCE CENTER 1	<u>FUND</u>				
Personal Services	~	014 500	•		
Materials & Services	\$	914,523 102,854	-0-	\$	914,523
Capital Outlay		1,000	-0- -0-		102,854
Transfers		791,190	-0-		1,000 791,190
Contingency		8,333	-0-		8,333
Unappropriated Balance		16,750	-0-		16,750
•••	_		-	_	101100
Total Intergovernmental Resource					
Center Fund Requirements	\$1	,834,650	-0-	\$1	,834,650

EXHIBIT B (continued)

	Adopted Appropriation FY 1986-87	Revision	Revised Appropriation
BUILDING MANAGEMENT FUND			
Personal Services Materials & Services Capital Outlay Contingency	\$ 28,356 487,962 181,026 74,174	-0- -0- -0- -0-	\$ 28,356 487,962 181,026 74,174
Total Building Management Fund Requirements	\$ 771,518	-0-	\$ 771,518
ZOO OPERATING FUND			
Personal Services Materials & Services Capital Outlay Transfers Contingency Unappropriated Balance	\$ 3,444,553 2,078,321 422,182 3,164,539 428,883 531,091	-0- -0- -0- -0- -0-	\$ 3,444,553 2,078,321 422,182 3,164,539 428,883 531,091
Total Zoo Operating Fund Requirements	\$10,069,569	-0-	\$10,069,569
ZOO CAPITAL FUND			
Personal Services Capital Projects Contingency Unappropriated Balance	\$ 48,581 5,962,820 270,236 2,583,760	-0- -0- -0- -0-	\$ 48,581 5,962,820 270,236 2,583,760
Total Zoo Capital Fund Requirements	\$ 8,865,397	-0-	\$ 8,865,397
SOLID WASTE OPERATING FUND			
Personal Services Materials & Services Capital Outlay Transfers Contingency Unappropriated Balance	\$ 1,113,807 7,679,320 88,800 3,652,312 2,671,533 63,333	-0- 471,000 -0- -0- (471,000) -0-	\$ 1,113,807 8,150,230 88,800 3,652,312 2,200,533 63,333
Total Solid Waste Operating Fund Requirements	\$15,269,105	-0-	\$15,269,105
SOLID WASTE CAPITAL FUND			
Capital Projects	\$ 6,080,000	<u>-0-</u>	\$ <u>6,080,000</u>
Total Solid Waste Capital Fund Requirements	\$ 6,080,000	-0-	\$ 6,080,000

EXHIBIT B (continued)

	Adopted Appropriation FY 1986-87	Revision	Revised Appropriation
SOLID WASTE DEBT SERVICE FUND			
Materials & Services	\$ <u>1,207,100</u>	<u>-0-</u>	\$ <u>1,207,100</u>
Total Solid Waste Debt Service Fund Requirements	\$1,207,100	-0-	\$1,207,100
ST. JOHNS RESERVE FUND			
Unappropriated Balance	\$ <u>1,550,700</u>	<u>-0-</u>	\$ <u>1,550,700</u>
Total St. Johns Reserve Fund Requirements	\$1,550,700	-0-	\$1,550,700
ST. JOHNS FINAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND			
Capital Projects Contingency Unappropriated Balance	\$ 805,000 85,000 1,534,500	-0- -0- <u>-0-</u>	\$ 805,000 85,000 1,534,500
Total St. Johns Final Improvement Fund Requirements	\$2,424,500	-0-	\$2,424,500
ST. JOHNS METHANE RECOVERY FUND			
Personal Services Materials & Services Unappropriated Balance	\$ 7,295 13,400 16,305	-0- -0- <u>-0-</u>	\$ 7,295 13,400 16,305
Total St. Johns Methane Recovery Fund Requirements	\$ 37,000	-0-	\$ 37,000
CONVENTION, TRADE, AND SPECTATOR F	'ACILITIES		
Personal Services Materials & Services Capital Outlay Transfers Contingency	\$122,644 226,200 -0- -0- 51,156	-0- -0- -0- -0- -0-	\$122,644 226,200 -0- -0- 51,156
Total Convention, Trade, Spectator Facilities Management Fund Requirements	\$400,000	-0-	\$400,000
SEWER ASSISTANCE FUND			
Materials & Services	\$ <u>856,689</u>	<u>-0-</u>	\$ <u>856,689</u>
Total Sewer Assistance Fund Requirements	\$856,689	-0-	\$856,689

EXHIBIT B (continued)

	Adopted Appropriation FY 1986-87	Revision	Revised Appropriation
INSURANCE FUND			
Materials & Services Contingency	\$317,204 60,000	-0- -0-	317,204 60,000
Total Insurance Fund Requirements	\$377,204	-0-	\$377,204
REHABILITATION & ENHANCEMENT FUND			
Materials & Services Contingency	\$472,185 160,655	-0- -0-	\$472,185 160,655
Total Rehabilitation & Enhancement Fund	\$632,840	-0-	\$632,840
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANC	E FUND		
Materials & Services	\$ <u>48,067</u>	<u>-0-</u>	\$ 48,067
Total Transportation Technical Assistance Fund Requirements	\$ 48,067	-0-	\$ 48,067

JS/g1 6297C/471-1 09/25/86

STAFF REPORT

Agenda Item No. 7.1 Meeting Date Oct. 9, 1986

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION NO. 86-691, AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 86-659, AND REVISING THE FY 1986-87 BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS SCHEDULE

Date: September 25, 1986

Presented by: Jennifer Sims

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

The Council approved an intergovernmental agreement with Marion County regarding waste disposal at its September 25, 1986, meeting. It is estimated that this agreement will incur an estimated total expense of \$471,000 in FY 1986-87. This expense is not budgeted though adequate funds are available from contingency. A budget amendment is proposed to transfer these funds from contingency to the "Payments to Other Agencies" line item in the materials & services category of the Solid Waste Operating Fund. This revision is in the St. Johns Landfill program. A corresponding revision to the Appropriations Schedule is needed.

Details of the proposed revision are displayed in Exhibits A and B to Resolution No. 86-691.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

The Executive Officer recommends adoption of Resolution No. 86-691.

JS/g1 6297C/471-2 09/26/86 Metro Council October 9, 1986 Page 8

that could be charged on the contract before the General Election. He also explained the amount to be raised in the LID would be the largest to date in the city of Portland. Bonds would only be sold after the election, he said, and staff were working to ensure that other funding elements were in place as soon as possible.

Councilor Collier agreed with Councilor Van Bergen that the contract was not needed before the election. She also wanted to review the final version of the contract before she approved it.

In response to Councilor Ragsdale's question, Mr. Wilson said if both Metro's general obligation bond measure and Ballot Measure No. 9 (a tax limitation measure) passed, it would be important to immediately commense with the sale of bonds.

A discussion followed about the probable impact of a tax limitation measure on bond sales for the CTS project. Presiding Officer Waker said the selection committee had not made their recommendation with tax limitation measures in mind and the Council had to proceed in good faith.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Cooper, Gardner, Hansen, Kirkpatrick,

Ragsdale and Waker

Nays: Councilors Collier, Frewing, Kelley and Van Bergen

Absent: Councilors DeJardin and Kafoury

The motion carried and the contract was approved.

Councilor Van Bergen said he wanted the representatives of Shiels and Obletz to know he voted against approving the contract because of timing issues, not because he did not endorse the recommended contractor. He wished a positive message be sent to the contractor that the Council had their support on the project.

7. RESOLUTIONS

7.1 Consideration of Resolution No. 86-691, for the Purpose of Amending Resolution No. 86-659 and Revising the FY 1986-87
Budget and Appropriations Schedule (to Provide Funds for the Waste Disposal Agreement with Marion County) (Public Hearing)

Jennifer Sims, Director of Management Services, explained the Council had previously authorized an intergovernmental agreement with Marion County regarding waste disposal. The agreement would incur

Metro Council October 9, 1986 Page 9

an additional, estimated expense of about \$471,000 in FY 1986-87. Adoption of Resolution No. 86-691 would authorize the transfer of \$471,000 from the Solid Waste Operating Contingency Fund to the St. Johns Landfill program to fund the project.

Presiding Officer Waker opened the public hearing on the Resolution. There being no testimony, he closed the public hearing.

Motion: Councilor Gardner moved the Resolution be adopted and

Councilor Kirkpatrick seconded the motion.

Vote: A vote on the motion resulted in:

Ayes: Councilors Collier, Cooper, Frewing, Gardner, Hansen,

Kelley, Kirkpatrick, Ragsdale, Van Bergen and Waker

Absent: Councilors DeJardin and Kafoury

The motion carried and Resolution No. 86-691 was adopted.

7.2 Resolution No. 86-692, for the Purpose of Establishing Opposition to Ballot Measure Nos. 9 and 11

Donald Carlson, Deputy Executive Officer, outlined the proposed impact of Ballot Measure Nos. 9 and 11 to the Metropolitan Service District as discussed in his memorandum to Councilors dated October 1, 1986, that was included in the agenda packet.

Councilor Collier asked why Ballot Measure No. 12 had not been addressed in Resolution No. 86-692. Mr. Carlson said it was not included because the Ballot Measure was not harmful to Metro's interests.

A discussion followed about whether the Council should take a position opposing Ballot Measure No. 12. Presiding Officer Waker questioned the wisdom of taking a position on a ballot measure that was not directly related to Metro's interests.

Councilor Van Bergen asked counsel to comment on the propriety of the Council taking a position to ensorse or oppose specific issues on the ballot. Eleanore Baxendale, General Counsel, advised it was within the Council's authority to take a position on any issue directly related to Metro's concerns.

Councilor Gardner said he would have difficulty voting for Resolution No. 86-692 because the probable impact on Ballot Measure No. 11 was very speculative. He opposed combining the issues of the two ballot measure in one Resolution.